

VU Research Portal

Murray's Dutch Mirror. On Rewriting the English Grammar

Noordegraaf, J.

published in

Two Hundred Years of Lindley Murray
1996

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Noordegraaf, J. (1996). Murray's Dutch Mirror. On Rewriting the English Grammar. In I. Tiekens-Boon van Ostade (Ed.), *Two Hundred Years of Lindley Murray* (pp. 107-123). Nodus Publikationen.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

MURRAY'S DUTCH MIRROR

On rewriting the *English Grammar*

Jan Noordegraaf

"I hate grammar. What's the use of it?"
George Eliot, *Middlemarch*

1. Introduction

In the Netherlands, the second decade of the nineteenth century not only saw the end of the so-called 'French period', but also the publication of a Dutch version of Lindley Murray's *English Grammar*. Is there any relation between the two? One might argue that there was. In 1795, when Murray's English grammar was published in York, the federalist Republic of the Seven United Provinces was transformed into the so-called Batavian Republic, a close ally of France. Later on, this republic became the Kingdom of Holland, which became an official part of France in 1810. In 1813, the Kingdom of the Netherlands came into existence when the country was liberated from French occupation. Due to the prolonged French influence many political and cultural changes had taken place, leading to administrative and educational reforms which had a long lasting effect. These reforms included a government regulation concerning the written Dutch language, something which had never existed before. Commissioned by the government, the Rotterdam clergyman, Pieter Weiland (1754-1842), wrote the *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* ('Dutch Grammar'), published in 1805, and the Leiden professor of Dutch Language, Matthijs Siegenbeek (1774-1854), devised a spelling system in 1804.

In the wake of the government efforts to reform the entire system of (primary) education (cf. Wilhelm 1993:68-71)

the position of the foreign languages as school subjects was seriously reconsidered with frequent claims for the inclusion of English and German by the side of French in the school programmes. As a result, English began to be offered as an optional subject in some schools and by growing numbers of private teachers (Loonen 1991:19).

In the first quarter of the century, English was hardly taught in the Netherlands, and it was to be quite some time before the general Dutch population became better acquainted with the language. As Loonen pointed out, not more than two dozen titles of English manuals appeared in the Netherlands during the eighteenth century, as compared to 695 titles in the nineteenth

century. Thus, Lindley Murray's English grammar was Dutchified in order to serve the needs of a public that was virtually unfamiliar with the English language.¹

How the gradual change in attitude towards English actually took place in the course of the nineteenth century and its impact on teaching and teaching materials is a subject for an extensive monograph-length study. As a modest contribution to such an investigation, this paper is of a rather different scope. Here I will focus only on two applications of Murray's work in the Netherlands: 1) its adaptation for the Dutch public, and, 2) a very special grammar of Dutch which was (indirectly) based on Murray's work.

2. The *English Grammar* in Dutch garment

In 1816, the first Dutch edition of the *English Grammar* appeared in print. In the course of the nineteenth century this *Engelsche Spraakkunst* saw a number of reeditions. This section opens with an overview of the various editions and then goes on to examine the extent to which the Dutch editions differ from their English original.

2.1. Editions

The first Dutch edition of Murray's grammar was published in 1816 under the title *Engelsche Spraakkunst; naar de zes en twintigste Engelsche uitgave. Bewerkt volgens de leernwijze van Agron, ten dienste der Scholen, en der genen die de Engelsche Taal, op eene spoedige wijze, grondig willen leeren* ("English grammar; after the 26th English edition [1816]. Adapted according to Agron's method. For the use by schools and those who wish to master the English tongue swiftly and thoroughly"). The grammar was published in the city of Haarlem by C.H. Bohn, a well-known Dutch publishing house. The name of the adaptor is neither mentioned on the title page nor in the very brief foreword. In the preface, the anonymous author tells his readers that he had ventured to prepare an adaptation of Murray's grammar for the Dutch youth since it had been so favourably received in England. "Adapted according to Agron's method" meant that the Dutch author had added exercises so that the language rules could be practised properly.² In addition, he added grammatical information known to native speakers of English, but unknown to foreigners, such as explicit remarks on the use of prepositions. Finally, the syntactical part was drastically altered. I will return to that point later.

Notably, two years later, in 1818, the same author published a book containing exercises to go with the theory: *Engelsche lees-oefeningen en vertalingsproeven, tot gebruik voor de scholen en het privaatonderwijs: voorzien van een woordenboekje en de noodige aanwijzingen, om het Engelsch spoedig en goed te leeren uitspreken*. It was composed by 'den vertaler en omwerker van Murray's Engelsche spraakkunst', and it was also published by Bohn. But who, then, was the translator and rewriter of Murray's grammar? A search in the Bohn archives, which are kept at the Leiden University Library, revealed the name of the translator. On page 22 of his *Onkostenboek* (expense account) for the years 1810-1829, the publisher François Bohn noted: "Murray, *Engelsche Spraakkunst* [...] twenty sheets translation and adaptation by R. van der Pijl at Dord[recht] à 10: f 200,=". According to these notes, 625 copies of the book were printed.

Rudolph van der Pijl (1790-1828) was an "instituteur et maître des langues à Dordrecht", and a prolific composer of various schoolbooks. Among other things, he wrote an English grammar (1811), English textbooks (1814), a *Gemeenzame leerwijz, voor degenen, die de Engelsche taal beginnen te leren* (1814),³ a *Grammaire Hollandaise pratique*, a translation into French of Weiland's grammar (1815), and *A practical grammar of the Dutch language* (1819¹, 1884⁶). He also published various French textbooks. Without any doubt, Rudolph van der Pijl was a most productive writer on grammar, though he seems not to have been a first rate one (De Vos 1939:75). Be that as it may, the *Engelsche Spraakkunst* was very favourably reviewed in the periodical *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* in 1817 (vol. I, 165-167). In the opinion of the anonymous reviewer, it easily surpassed earlier English grammar books, which were usually boring or incomplete.

In 1822, a second edition of the grammar was published by François Bohn's son-in-law, the Amsterdam publisher G.J.A. Beijerinck, who had bought part of Bohn's list of books at the auction following François Bohn's demise in 1819. This time, however, van der Pijl's name was mentioned: the unsigned preface to the second edition relates that the publisher expected that, as the first edition had been so well received in the press, this edition was also to be received "with new eagerness" by the 'Heeren Instituteurs en Schoolonderwijzers'. According to Beijerinck's foreword, it was Mr. van der Pijl, the first to have introduced this booklet into his Dordrecht institute, who had now contributed to "the perfection of this work": he had looked through it and provided various additions.⁴

A third edition followed from the same publisher in 1829, a fourth in 1837, a fifth in 1846, which was slightly abridged, but not fundamentally changed, by a certain G.W.B.⁵ In 1852, Frederick Martin Cowan (1822-1862), a 'lector' at the Amsterdam Gymnasium at the time, produced the sixth edition, a corrected version which was published this time in Zaltbommel by Joh. Noman. Interestingly, a copy of Cowan's edition, like some of van der Pijl's books, were even available in Japan to those natives who had mastered the complexities of the Dutch language and were seeking to learn English (cf. *List*, p. 51). Two years later, in cooperation with another language master, A.B. Maatjes, Cowan edited an English textbook, which saw many reprints. Subsequently, it was Maatjes, a prolific writer of textbooks for modern languages, who wrote the seventh (1860) and eighth (1871) editions of Murray's *Engelse spraakkunst*. As far as I have been able to ascertain, no further editions followed (cf. De Breet & Creton 1981:15-16). There are indeed various differences between the editions I was able to examine; evidently, later editors of the *Engelsche Spraakkunst* returned to their English sources, as some examples show, but this did not result in major changes in the set-up of the grammar.

2.2. Murray in a Dutch mirror⁶

Many eighteenth-century grammarians, including Lindley Murray, divided grammar into four parts: "English grammar is divided into four parts, viz. orthography, etymology, syntax, and prosody" (EG:13). When comparing the English version to the Dutch one, the most striking thing is that the Dutch rewriter skipped two entire parts of the grammar, as well as the appendix. Part one, orthography and part four, prosody, were both deleted. Note that in eighteenth-century Dutch grammars prosody was generally not included (cf. Knol 1977:80). Moreover, as the Dutch reader was supposed to be familiar with the letters and the principles of orthography, the

Engelsche Spraakkunst (furthermore *ES*) could aptly be reduced to two 'Afdeelingen' (sections): Part one on etymology, and part two on syntax. Possibly, this arrangement of *ES* was inspired by Weiland's *Nederduitsche spraakkunst* (1805), the official Dutch 'state grammar'. After all, the grammar was in use at every Dutch school. In his foreword to the first edition of *ES*, van der Pijl pointed out that he modelled the Dutch passages according to Weiland and Siegenbeek's rules, much as he had in his *Gemeenſame leerwijs, voor degenen, die de Engelsche taal beginnen te leren* (1814), and his *Grammaire Hollandaise pratique* (1815), in the preface of which he claims to have followed Weiland and Siegenbeek, whose works "sont généralement reçus dans notre pays". Furthermore, as van der Pijl remarked, exercises had been added to each chapter, "in order to make it possible to practice the rules of language". To what extent now did van der Pijl actually conform to Weiland's *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* in translating Murray?

Etymology. I think it can safely be concluded that the first part of *ES*, etymology, is an adapted translation of its English counterpart. A detailed discussion of all the differences between the Dutch book and its *Vorlage* is beyond the scope of this paper. The set-up of chapters in the 'Eerste Afdeeling, over de Etymologie' remained largely unaltered. However, I will discuss a few differences in a brief way.

In Murray's book one finds nine parts of speech, and in this respect, van der Pijl followed his English example rather than Weiland, who distinguished ten parts of speech. Note, however, that in *ES* the numeral, a tenth part of speech, which Murray deals with very briefly, is discussed in the chapter on adjectives. However, the subclassification of the numeral in four types differs from that of Weiland's grammar.

Murray distinguishes three kinds of pronouns: personal, relative, adjective pronouns, a classification which was quite unusual in Dutch contemporary grammar. So, van der Pijl noted:

I prefer the classification in six kinds, as this is more common and can be found in most of the grammars. There is also no reason why one should prefer the first classification (*ES*:36n.)

Consequently, the Dutch version shows a classification of six classes: personal, possessive, demonstrative, interrogative, relative, indefinite. Weiland (1805) has also six classes, but his classification is slightly different.

The number of cases is another interesting matter. According to Murray, substantives have three cases, namely the nominative, the possessive, and the objective. Van der Pijl remarks that opinions widely vary in this respect, but eventually he presents the classical six cases, thus departing from Weiland's 1805 grammar, which mentions only four cases for Dutch.

Murray pays some attention to auxiliary verbs, whereas Weiland devotes a whole section to them. Van der Pijl then discusses the auxiliaries as a separate kind of verb.

In summary, the etymological part of *ES* can be seen as a slightly adapted translation of the corresponding part of Murray's *English Grammar*. The differences that were found can be traced back to some extent to Weiland's official grammar of Dutch, in other words, they can be seen as a conscious adaptation to the contemporary Dutch grammatical system. However, it must be assumed that van der Pijl also had other English grammars on his desk when working on his

translation. A comparison with his earlier works in the field of English might provide more insight, but such an investigation is beyond the scope of this article.

In the 1860s, the writer Jacob van Lennep Dutchified a humorous version of Murray's grammar. It has been established that van Lennep, when adapting the English translation to a grammar of Dutch which was authoritative in the 1850s, made alterations very similar to those van der Pijl made some fifty years before. For instance, van Lennep felt obliged to insert a section on numerals, and to choose a different classification of pronouns. I will return to van Lennep's grammar later.

Syntax. In the preface to the first edition, Van der Pijl wrote: "I have also changed the order, which is to be found in Murray's syntax, and I did so after the usual manner, from which Murray's syntax deviates". It is not surprising therefore that the 'Tweede Afdeeling, over de Syntaxis' rather differs from its English source. As is well-known, Murray discusses syntax in twenty-two rules, whereas all Dutch editors address syntax in the same way, discussing etymology, viz. per part of speech, beginning with the article and ending with the interjection. This fairly traditional set-up is fully compatible with that of Weiland's syntax.

Although the *EG*'s table of contents reflects the same order in the parts of speech found in the discussion in the etymological part, Part III, syntax, does not adhere to the same order. In fact, Murray discusses the various parts of speech in relation to their place in the sentence. Obviously, the Dutch editors preferred to stick to a more traditional set-up, which implies more or less a repetition of the etymological part, beginning with the article and ending with the interjection. Thus, each syntactical chapter demonstrates how a certain part of speech can be used, viz. how it can be combined with other words to form word groups. Consequently, a host of examples and phrases were borrowed both from Murray's syntactical rules and etymological observations. Subsequently, the material was arranged in the "usual manner", viz. as it was done in Weiland's model. This shows a fairly traditional view on syntax: what was discussed was the combination of words, not so much questions of word order in the sentence.

Finally, *ES* has no appendix following the part on syntax, but it concludes with a number of "themes on all language rules and parts of speech in general; as a further exercise in translation" (*ES* 271). One of the major differences between the two books is that each 'theoretical' section is followed by a series of practical exercises relevant to the subject just discussed, viz. translation themes with a list of new vocabulary.

Conclusion. Van der Pijl called himself an 'omwerker', a rewriter, not just a translator, of Murray's grammar. I feel that this self characterisation is justified. He departed from Murray, especially in the syntactical part, conforming to another English tradition or to the canons of Dutch grammar. He must have skipped two full parts of the grammar and substituted a host of exercises because he considered such exercises as the indispensable foundation of language learning.

3. Murray in the carnival mirror

3.1. 1840: Murray and Leigh⁷

The year 1840 saw the publication of a *Comic English Grammar*, which by its subtitle was characterized as "a new and facetious introduction to the English Tongue". Although the grammar was published anonymously, it is well-known that the author was Percival Leigh (1813-1889), who worked for *Punch* from 1841 until his death. Leigh was the author of several other comic works, including a book on *Manners and Customs of ye Englyshe* (1849), which has been described as a clever sarcastic chronicle of prevailing fashions and opinions. In 1840, Leigh also published a *Comic Latin Grammar*, whose title page revealed as little about the author's identity as the first grammar. Both the comic grammars were beautifully illustrated by Leigh's good friend, John Leech (1817-1864), who was also associated with *Punch*, and, more importantly, who was a most prolific and original wood-engraver. Both grammars saw various reprints in the course of the nineteenth century. One of these reprints, which appeared in 1851 in Bentley's shilling series, played a role in the discussion concerning the Dutch adaptation of Leigh's grammar.

As Zandvoort (1968a:324) once remarked concerning the contents of the *Comic English Grammar*: "With a great deal of wry humour the [...] author throws light on the social and linguistic practices and prejudices of the middle of the nineteenth century". It is interesting to note that in Leigh we find a "keen and humorous observer" of spoken contemporary English (Zandvoort 1968a:326). That distinguishes his book from the numerous nineteenth-century grammars that are based almost entirely on the written language. However 'modern' Leigh the linguist may appear in this respect, the grammar also shows Leigh to be a typical representative of English nineteenth-century bourgeoisie, expressing all its prejudices against lower classes, foreigners, and their linguistic usage. His remarks are often more satirical than humorous, the grammar being full with nasty remarks directed at various parties. For example, he derides American English ("Comic English in a '*pretty particular considerable tarnation*' degree") quite often in a venomous way, and continuously he places the French in an unfavourable light ("Did it rain to-morrow?" asked Monsieur Grenouille. 'Yes it was!' replied Monsieur Crapaud"). Unfortunately, Leigh did not escape from the anti-semitism which was quite common in the nineteenth century, as some of his remarks reveal ("The articulation of the Jew is particularly ridiculous. The 'peoplesh' are badly spoken of, and not well-spoken"). Be this as it may, it is only fair to say that he did not spare his compatriots either. Not only did Leigh make many a humorous observation on the linguistic usage of the lower classes, he also levelled sharp criticism against his social equals and superiors.

Given the reputation of Murray's *English Grammar* - in *Middlemarch*, George Eliot assures the reader that Mrs. Garth even "in a general wreck of society would have tried to hold her 'Lindley Murray' above the waves" -, it is no surprise that Leigh based his comic grammar on Murray's work. A cartoon of a surly Lindley Murray can be found at the top of the beautifully contrasting illustrations (an old bitch versus a cheerful clown teaching a class of children) which were printed opposite the title page. Thus, Leigh's book can be regarded as a 'comic' version of the *English Grammar*. For example, Leigh models his approach to syntax on Murray's twenty-two rules of syntax. Compare the following remarks:

- To produce the agreement and right disposition of words in a sentence, the following rules and observations should be carefully studied (EG:139)
- To produce the agreement and right disposition of words in a sentence, the following rules (and observations?) should be carefully studied (CG:125)

In many cases, Leigh adds a humorous twist to Murray's phrases . A few examples must suffice here.

- A sentence is an assembly of words, forming a complete sense. (EG:153)
- A sentence is an assembly of words, forming a complete sense. Sometimes, however, a sentence is an aggregate of words forming complete nonsense (CG:118)

Likewise, Murray's "The master who taught us" (EG:153) becomes Leigh's "The master who flogged us" (CG:137).

3.2. 1865: Murray in double Dutch

On 25 November 1865, the reader of *De Nederlandsche Spectator*, a popular nineteenth-century Dutch weekly, could find a letter to the editor written by a certain J. v. R., who demanded attention to the 1851 one shilling edition of the *Comic English grammar*. J. v. R. was in fact the Hague jurist Jacob de Witte van Citters esquire (1817-1876), who contributed regularly to the *Spectator*. He pointed out that this comic grammar contained a host of thoughts and expressions which were completely identical to those he had seen in a *Vermakelijke Spraakkunst* which he had bought recently, a comic grammar of Dutch, which according to its title page had been composed by "a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences". Substantiating his claim by giving various examples, J.v.R. conjectured in his tongue-in-cheek way that as the *Spraakkunst* had no date on its title page, it might be of a much earlier date than the *Comic grammar* ! Thus, he ventured to conclude, the author of the *Comic English grammar* did not have a very original mind. Similarly, J.v.R. turned the relationship between the illustrations upside down, noting that the pictures in the two grammars also showed a rather close resemblance. As he suggested mockingly, the late John Leech must have found his inspiration in the pictures of his Dutch predecessor, the Hague painter and engraver Elchanon Verveer (1826-1900).

As it happened, the readers of *De Nederlandsche Spectator* had already been informed that the *Vermakelijke Spraakkunst* had appeared just a few weeks previously in Amsterdam, and it was common knowledge which "member of the Academy" had written this grammar. Its author was the Dutch man of letters, Jacob van Lennep (1802-1868), a well-known author of historical novels, among other things.⁸ It is indeed true that nowhere in the *Vermakelijke Spraakkunst* does the author openly acknowledge that the book is based on Leigh's grammar. In the *Spectator* discussion that resulted from J.v.R's disclosure, van Lennep never denied this fact - of course, how could he ? However, he forcefully rejected any accusation of being a plagiarist. In the *Spectator* of 9 December 1865, van Lennep, writing under the transparent pseudonym of Q.N.,

sought to exculpate the illustrator, Elchanon Verveer, who was given only the Dutch manuscript by the publisher, and commissioned to make 56 illustrations for this text. As far as I have been able to determine, it is very plausible that Verveer was not aware (*pace* Zandvoort 1968b:337) of the English grammar before reading J.v.R.'s letter in the *Spectator*.

En passant, van Lennep tried to defend himself. "A Dutch grammar, which is supposed to be a translation from an English grammar! Such an idea is so absurd that nobody would have believed it!". Furthermore, van Lennep argued, he had also borrowed material from a number of Dutch grammars, and, finally, had managed to set his proper stamp on the book in such a way that *De Vermakelijke Spraakkunst* could safely be considered to be an original work" and was thus the author (or "compiler, as you wish") of the comic grammar of Dutch. A response in the next issue of the *Spectator*, however, shows that van Lennep's attempt to evade the key question had not gone unnoticed. Be this as it may, it was generally acknowledged that, as a translation, van Lennep's work was a masterpiece, for he had often managed to Dutchify the English examples most inventively. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the strategic publication of the book a few weeks before the Dutch 'Sinterklaasfeest', the feast of St Nicholas (5 December), when gifts are traditionally exchanged, resulted in the sale of 3000 copies within three weeks. A second printing followed in December 1865, and a third one in December 1866.

The reader who knows his 'Murray' also knows how van Lennep's book is structured. Unlike van der Pijl, van Lennep maintained the parts on orthography and prosody, and his approach to syntax is based on the twenty-two rules we find in Murray/Leigh. On several points, however, van Lennep felt obliged to bring his text into conformity with Dutch grammatical tradition - after all, he was writing a grammar of Dutch. From the differences between the two manuscripts of the Dutch comical grammar that are kept in the University Library of Leiden, it can be concluded that in 1864, van Lennep added a substantial Dutch layer to an earlier manuscript version, which dates back to 1860⁹ and includes a strongly adapted, but rather unpolished version of Leigh 1840. The 1864 revision resulted, among other things, in the insertion of numerous quotes in the final version from contemporary Dutch grammarians such as W.G. Brill (1811-1896) and G. Kuyper (1815-1879). A number of differences between the English and the Dutch comic grammars concerning the order and the number of the parts of speech can be easily traced back to the influence of Brill's learned Dutch grammars, such as his *Nederlandsche Spraakleer* (three volumes, 1852-1866). In my opinion, it was mainly on the basis of Brill that van Lennep sought to Dutchify Leigh to such an extent. Still the fact remains true that at least half of the Dutch book is simply a translation from the English, as Zandvoort astutely remarked. But the spirit that greets the reader is quite different: compared to Leigh, who is satirical and sharp, van Lennep comes over as a bit sugary. I think these books could be fruitfully used in a study of the differences between the nineteenth-century English and Dutch humour.

Finally, I would like to point to a more serious feature of the Dutch *Spraakunst* that deserves mention here. Van Lennep's book also contains many references to the debate on Dutch spelling, which had taken place during the years 1855-1858 in the Royal Netherlands Academy, and which had raised an interesting theoretical issue, the question of the priority of spoken language to written language. In 1855, the orientalist Taco Roorda (1801-1874) had delivered a lecture in which he had postulated the primacy of spoken language, and consequently had proposed a reform of the written language, doing away with case endings and other archaic

forms in written Dutch. His lecture, however, had prompted indignant protests from more conservative linguists such as Willem G. Brill and other honourable men, who considered the written language more or less as sacrosanct. In the late 1850s, Jacob van Lennep had endorsed Roorda's point of view, and, consequently, in the *Vermakelijke Spraakkunst* one can find various explicit approving references to Roorda's standpoint in conjunction with many jibes at Brill. Like Leigh, who was opposed to Murray in this respect, van Lennep took up position against current viewpoints in traditional Dutch linguistics by seeking to present in his grammar specimens of contemporary living language. I think it is safe to conclude that in composing his comic grammar, van Lennep wished to make a serious contribution to the debate concerning spoken and written language that was to keep Dutch linguistics under its spell for many years to come (for details cf. Noordegraaf 1990). In the early 1890s, the fourth edition of Murray's Dutch grandchild brought Roorda's opinions to the attention of a new generation of linguists and schoolmasters associated with the periodical *Taal en Letteren* (1891-1906), a "new and heretical revolutionary journal", which was to breathe new life into philology and to revolutionize native language education in the Netherlands under the slogan 'language is sound'. The reprint was welcomed by a new generation of educators who saw Taco Roorda as their forerunner in the battle against the dominance of the written language. Small wonder then that in *Taal en Letteren* van Lennep's grammar was hailed as most instructive for those who were studying the mother tongue (cf. *Taal en Letteren* 1 (1891), 78).

For the sake of completeness I would like to point out that in 1866, Jacob van Lennep also published his version of Leigh's 1840 *Comic Latin Grammar*. The Dutch title reads: *De Vermakelijke Latijnsche Spraakkunst, ten nutte der jeugd samengesteld door een liefhebber der Latijnsche tale*. The illustrations were designed by J.W.F. Kachel, who named himself Johannes Kachelius for the occasion. In the Dutch verse preceding the grammar, the composer noted: "this book was, of course, translated from the English language". No discussion on plagiarism followed.

4. Final remarks

In the preface of the sixth revised and improved edition (1852) of the *Engelsche Spraakkunst*, Frederick Cowan pointed out the success of this grammar:

Being requested by the publishers to present a new edition of this textbook I have accepted this task all the more willingly because the publication of a sixth edition of a grammar is - at least in our country - such a rare occasion that it can be regarded as a secure assurance of its reliability. Moreover, given Murray's reputation amongst English grammarians his grammar requires no further recommendation (Cowan 1852:vi).

One could add to this remark that several 'satellites', translations and adaptations of other works by Murray, such as other grammars or reading books, were also published in the Netherlands.¹⁰ A final assesment of Murray's impact, however, can only be given within the context of a full-fledged study on English language teaching in the Netherlands.

From a theoretical standpoint, Leigh's comic grammar and van Lennep's Dutch version of it show how ideas on what ought to be the basis of a grammar were changing: it was the living language which was to be described. Secondly, one could say that the case of van der Pijl's rewriting Murray's grammar reveals a glimmer of the 'essential tension' a foreign language teacher has always to cope with: the tension between what is familiar to his pupils and what is foreign, a tension which is inherent to most work done in language teaching.

Notes

1. So, works of a varied character were translated from English into Dutch. To give just one example, the Scottish professor in rhetoric Hugh Blair (1718-1800) was rather well-known in the Netherlands, not only for his *Sermons* (1777-1801), which were translated into Dutch in the years 1778-1803 (ten volumes), but also for his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres* (1783), which were a rich source for Dutch grammarians and stylisticians. There are several Dutch translations of these *Lectures*; the first one appeared in 1788-90, the last one, much elaborated, in 1845.

2. Antoine Nicolas Agron (1762-1799), who was, among other things, "maître de l'école française et recteur de l'école latine" at Elburg, was the founder of a method to teach the Dutch youth French using a series of translation exercises, the so-called 'opstellen'. His *Verzameling van opstellen, geschikt om de Nederlandsche jeugd, door middel van haare moedertaal, [...] tot de kennis der Fransche taale op te leiden [...] Uitgegeven ten gebruike der Fransche scholen* appeared in 1794 and saw regular reprints (1865¹²). Cf. Riemens 1919:234.

3. According to the subtitle of this book, Van der Pijl had followed "the famous Sheridan" for English, and Messrs Weiland and Siegenbeek for Dutch. Note that a revised fifth edition of this book (Dordrecht 1854) was even reprinted at Nagasaki, Japan, as late as 1857 - an aspect of the 'rangaku', the Japanese 'Hollandology'. Cf. *List*, p. 59.

4. G.D.J. Schotel, *De Illustre School te Dordrecht. Eene bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het schoolwezen in ons vaderland* (Utrecht 1857) remarks that, at Van der Pyl's school, the English language was taught "in an excellent manner" (p. 79).

5. The copy at the Amsterdam University Library has a written dedication to the Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen, the Dutch Society for Public Welfare.

6. For practical reasons I will base myself in this section primarily on the fourth edition (1837), so references are to this edition. In this section, I am much obliged to Kuypers 1993, from which I could take a number of data. The first and second edition of *ES* are unavailable in any Dutch public library. However, the prefaces to both the first and the second edition can be found in later editions. My observations are based on a study of copies of the third to sixth editions, which are available at the Univerity Library of Amsterdam. I was unable to obtain copies of later editions.

7. This section is based primarily on Zandvoort's publications on this subject.

8. In *De Nederlandsche Spectator* of 18 November 1865. Moreover, on 9 November 1865 a "comical review" was dedicated to the grammar. The *Spraakkunst* was listed in the *Nieuwsblad voor den Boekhandel*, the weekly in which all recently published Dutch books were announced. Note that this announcement mentions the name of the author, J. van Lennep.

9. One of his correspondents, the great Dutch nineteenth-century writer, Multatuli (Eduard Douwes Dekker, 1820-1887), wrote to van Lennep on 25 January 1860: "Why don't you write a Dutch grammar? Such a work from you would be welcomed and it might contribute to more

uniformity in our written language" (Multatuli, *Volledige Werken*, vol. 10 (Amsterdam 1960, 203-204). It can indeed be established that van Lennep's first manuscript, probably a revision of a lost version from the years 1856-57, dates to February 1860.

10. Cf., for instance, Lodewijk Hakbijl's frequently reprinted *Handleiding tot het lezen en beoefenen der Engelsche taal ... in voorbeelden met hunnen beteekenis, aangewezen uit Murray's leeslesjes* (1830).

References

Anon. 1952. *C.H. Bohn en zijn opvolgers 1752-1952*. Haarlem: Erven Bohn.

Breet, Gemma de & Rineke Creton. 1982. *Leerboeken Engels, Frans en Spaans in Nederland: 1796-1900. Inventarisatie, bibliografie en aanzet tot beschrijving*. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Toegepaste Taalkunde KU Nijmegen.

De Vos, H.J. 1939. *Moedertaalonderwijs in de Nederlanden. Een historisch-kritisch overzicht van de methoden bij de studie van de moedertaal in het middelbaar onderwijs sedert het begin van de 19e eeuw*. Turnhout: Van Mierlo-Proost.

Els, Theo J.M. van & Mathieu F. Knops. 1992. "Teaching of foreign languages in the Low Countries. In: Jan Noordegraaf, Kees Versteegh & Konrad Koerner (eds.), *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 273-304.

Knol, Jan. 1977. "De Nederlandse grammatica in de achttiende eeuw". In: Dick M. Bakker & Geert R.W. Dobbets, *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde*. Den Bosch: Malmberg.

Kuypers, Radboud. 1993. *De Nederlandse bewerkingen van Lindley Murray 'English Grammar'*. Unpubl. paper, Dept. of Dutch, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

[Leigh, Percival]. 1840. *The Comic English Grammar. A new and facetious introduction to the English Tongue* by the author of the *Comic Latin grammar*. Embellished with upwards of fifty characteristic illustrations by John Leech. London: Richard Bentley.

van Lennep, Jacob. 1865. *De Vermakelijke Spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: Binger. (Reprint of the 3rd ed. [1866], 's-Gravenhage: Nijgh & van Ditmar, 1985).

List of foreign books collected under the Shogunate Regime. Tokyo: Rangaka Shiryo Kenkyu Kai (Japanese Society for the Study of Dutch Learning) 1969 (first publ. 1957).

Loonen, Pieter L.M. 1991. *For to learne to buye and sell. Learning English in the Low Dutch Area between 1500 and 1800. A critical survey*. Amsterdam & Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press.

Murray, Lindley. *English Grammar*. York: Wilson. (References are to a later edition).

- Noordegraaf, Jan. 1985. "Jacob van Lennep en zijn *Vermakelijke Spraakkunst*". In: van Lennep 1865 [1985], 189-211.
- Noordegraaf, Jan. 1986. "Uit de wordingsgeschiedenis van *De Vermakelijke Spraakkunst*", *Nieuw Letterkundig Magazijn* IV, 7-10.
- Noordegraaf, Jan. 1990. "Trends in 19th-century linguistics and the debate in the Royal Dutch Academy (1855-1858)". In: Hans-Josef Niederehe & Konrad Koerner (eds.), *History and Historiography: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the History of Language Sciences (ICHOLS IV), Trier, 24-28 August 1987*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins 1990, 715-727.
- Riemens, K-J. 1919. *Esquisse historique de l'enseignement du Français en Hollande du XVIe au XIXe siècle*. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff.
- Wilhelm, Frans. 1993. "Training Foreign Language Teachers in the Netherland (1795-1970). An historical outline". In: Jan Noordegraaf & Frank Vonk (eds.), *Five Hundred Years of Foreign Language Teaching in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 67-87.
- Zandvoort, R.W. 1967. "Een vermakelijke Engelse spraakkunst uit 1851". *Levende Talen* 239, 227-231.
- Zandvoort, R.W. 1968a. "A Comic English Grammar of 1851". *Revue des Langues Vivantes - Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen* 34, 324-340.
- Zandvoort, R.W. 1968b. "Een vermakelijke Engelse spraakkunst uit 1851". *Levende Talen* 244, 104.

Appendix

List of editions of the *Engelsche Spraakkunst* (cf. De Breet & Creton 1982:15-16).

Engelsche Spraakkunst; naar de zes en twintigste Engelsche uitgave. Bewerkt volgens de leerwijze van Agron, ten dienste der Scholen, en dergenen die de Engelsche Taal, op eene spoedige wijze, grondig willen leeren. Haarlem: C.H. Bohn, 1816.

Engelsche spraakkunst, bewerkt door R. van der Pijl, volgens de leerwijze van Agron. 2de uitgaaf. Amsterdam: G.J.A. Beyerinck, 1822.

3rd ed. 1829; 4th ed. 1837; 5th ed. 1846, revised by G.W.B.

Engelsche spraakkunst, met toepasselijke opstellen ter vertaling. Ten dienste der scholen, en dergenen, die de Engelsche taal, op eene spoedige wijze, grondig willen leeren. 6th ed. revised by F.M. Cowan.

Zaltbommel: Joh. Noman 1852.

7th ed. Ibidem, 1860. Revised by A.B. Maatjes.

8th. ed. Zutphen: A.E.C. van Someren, 1871. Revised by A.B. Maatjes.